PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 2, 2013

Applicant	City of East Palo Alto	**Amount Requested**	$ 667,953
Proposal Title	Runnymede Storm Drain Phase II and O'Connor Pump Station Outfall Project	**Total Proposal Cost**	$ 1,527,508

PROJECT SUMMARY

The project is located in the City of East Palo Alto. The project follows already completed Phase I, which involved the installation of a box culvert at the northern end of the of the Runnymede channel where stormwater emerges from underground culverts. The culvert enables direct stormwater discharge to the Bay during low tides and diverts water to the conveyance channel and O'Connor Pump Station during high tides through a bypass structure on the box culvert. As the tide elevation increases, the discharge capacities of Phase I are reduced such that stormwater can no longer be discharged and the flow must be diverted to the South Channel. The proposed project consists of excavating and widening the South Channel along the length of the project area as well as the detention basin at the southern end of the project area. Approximately 13,000 cubic yards of material will be excavated from the combined areas and these excavated spoils will be used to create a small berm for added flood protection along the western side of the drainage channel and detention basin as well as increasing the capacity of the channel to account for a 100-year flood. The primary benefit is flood damage reduction. Secondary benefits are increased recreation, protection of pump station outfall, increased property values, and improved wetlands habitat.

PROPOSAL SCORE

<table>
<tr><th>Criteria</th><th>Score/
Max. Possible</th><th>Criteria</th><th>Score/
Max. Possible</th></tr>
<tr><td>Work Plan</td><td>9/15</td><td rowspan="2">Technical Justification</td><td rowspan="2">6/10</td></tr>
<tr><td>Budget</td><td>2/5</td></tr>
<tr><td>Schedule</td><td>1/5</td><td>Benefits and Cost Analysis</td><td>24/30</td></tr>
<tr><td>Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures</td><td>2/5</td><td>Program Preferences</td><td>8/10</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">Total Score (max. possible = 80)</td><td>52</td></tr>
</table>

EVALUATION SUMMARY

WORK PLAN

The criterion is less than fully addressed and rationales are insufficient. The projects relation to the adopted IRWM Plan is not addressed. The work plan provides relevant deliverables and 30% design plans but the tasks lack adequate detail and completeness to evaluate implementation of the project. For Example in Task 4 "Assessment and Evaluation" it is unclear what the project assessment and evaluation is or what the monitoring plans will cover. Additionally, the work plan notes that the original project has been split into 2 phases because one of the construction sites includes wetlands and critical habitat. This proposal is for the implementation of the phase that includes the wetlands and critical habitat, yet these concerns are not discussed further or elaborated on. There is insufficient detail in the work plan deliverables to determine if these benefits would be realized.

BUDGET

The budget does not have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4,many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking. Some costs appear unreasonable and there is no explanation for how the costs were estimated. For example, only $6,000 is budgeted to take the project design from its current 30% to 100%; and permitting is only estimated to cost $2,379, which appears unreasonable considering the number of and types of permits required for the implementation of the project. The matching funds were all attributed to a single source, a USEPA grant, but there are no details such as which EPA grant program would fund the costs, or whether the grant has yet been applied for. Additionally, there is no rationale for the provided lump sums.

SCHEDULE

The schedule is not consistent with the tasks presented in the work plan and budget, and not reasonable. There is no direct correspondence between the schedule tasks and budget items. The correspondence between the schedule and work plan is incomplete. For example, the description of Task 10: Construction in Attachment 3 (work plan, page 3-12) is not consistent with the schedules for this task which on the single sheet schedule are divided in to 3 separate subtasks. The status of CEQA documentation is described as in progress and full CEQA documentation is based on completion of 90% design which is scheduled to be started in April 2013; therefore it is unrealistic that CEQA documentation will be completed as scheduled in April 2013.

MONITORING, ASSESSMENT, AND PERFORMANCE MEASURES

The criterion is marginally addressed and documentation is incomplete and insufficient. There are no quantifiable metrics given for measurement of flooding, rainfall, or inundation areas to compare pre- and post-project. The monitoring targets and measurement tools and methods are not adequate for wetland ecosystem restoration. The applicant should have provided percent coverage targets, type of plant species targeted, and frequency of observation of plant and wildlife activity.

TECHNICAL JUSTIFICATION

The project appears to be technically justified to achieve the claimed benefits but lacks documentation that demonstrates the technical adequacy of the project. The applicant provides documentation for the project's flood damage reduction and protection of the O'Conner Pump Station. However, although inputs for hydrologic modeling

are described (GIS topography data, rainfall/flood data, NOAA tidal stage data, etc.), there is no discussion of the model itself or the modeling procedures. Additionally, the secondary benefits are not sufficiently documented. For example the ecosystem improvement benefit does not define with sufficient detail restoration of the areas to be dredged, and the need to achieve mitigation credits for the loss of wetlands due to the project. There is insufficient detail to describe how increased recreation, protection of pump station outfall, and increased property values will be achieved.

BENEFITS AND COST ANALYSIS

Collectively the proposal is likely to provide a high level of benefits in relationship to cost and this finding is supported by detailed, high quality analysis and clear and complete documentation. The Net Present Value (NPV) of costs is $1.5 million. Flood damages in the 2-year, 10-year, 25-year, and 50-year event are documented. Estimated Annual Damage reduction is estimated using FRAM to be $288,960, or $3.694 million on a NPV basis.

PROGRAM PREFERENCES

Applicant demonstrates a high degree of certainty that the proposal will achieve 2 program preferences and 6 statewide priorities by implementing the project, and documents the magnitude and breadth of them. The proposal will achieve the following: 1) Include regional projects or programs; 2) Effectively integrate water management programs and projects within hydrologic region; 3) Address critical water supply or water quality needs of disadvantaged communities within the region; 4) Climate Change Response Actions; 5) Expand Environmental Stewardship; 6) Practice Integrated Flood Management; 7) Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality; and 8) Ensure Equitable Distribution of Benefits.